



1985

University of Baltimore Law Review Volume 14 Number 3 (Spring 1985) Front Matter

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ubl>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1985) "University of Baltimore Law Review Volume 14 Number 3 (Spring 1985) Front Matter," *University of Baltimore Law Review*: Vol. 14: Iss. 3, Article 1.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ubl/vol14/iss3/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Baltimore Law Review by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. For more information, please contact snolan@ubalt.edu.

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
LAW REVIEW**

VOLUME 14

1984-1985

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE LAW REVIEW

VOLUME FOURTEEN

SPRING 1985

NUMBER THREE

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- Bivens* Actions For Federal
Employees in the Aftermath of
Bush v. Lucas: Which Remedies For Whom?
Barry F. Smith 413
- Maryland's Prompt Criminal Trial Provisions:
Hicks and Beyond
Harold Douglas Norton 447
- Health Claims Arbitration in Maryland:
The Experiment has Failed
James Kevin Mac Alister
Alfred L. Scanlan, Jr. 481

COMMENTS

- Putting the House in Order:
An Analysis of and Planning Considerations
For Home Office Deduction 522
- Preserving Historic Structures:
An Analysis of Regulatory Legislation
and Tax Incentives in Federal, Maryland,
and Municipal Law 557

CASENOTES

- Constitutional Law — Roadside Sobriety Tests may not be Admin-
istered by Law Enforcement Officials without Probable Cause to
Believe the Defendant was Driving while Intoxicated. *People v.*
Carlson, 677 P.2d 310 (Colo. 1984). 581

New Trials — Criminal Procedure — Constitutional Law — New Trial not Warranted unless Newly Discovered Evidence Satisfies Threshold Requirement of Materiality to the Outcome of the Case. *Stevenson v. State*, 299 Md. 297, 473 A.2d 450 (1984) 595

Criminal Procedure — Appellate Review of Sentencing — Sentencing Guidelines — Sentencing Judge's Mistaken Application of Sentencing Guidelines did not Require Appellate Court to Vacate Sentence when Sentence was within Statutory Limits and was the Result of the Judge's Good Faith Exercise of Discretion. *Teasley v. State*, 298 Md. 364, 470 A.2d 337 (1984) 603

BOOK REVIEWS

Paul V. Niemeyer and Linda M. Richards: Maryland Rules Commentary. Reviewed by *George W. White, Jr.* 611

Alan Watson: Sources of Law, Legal Change and Ambiguity. Reviewed by *Walter A. Rafalko* 614

UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

LAW REVIEW

VOLUME FOURTEEN

SPRING 1985

NUMBER THREE

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Alan G. Kaufman

Managing Editor

Linda Semesky Woolf

Articles Editors

Lori Lynn Blair
Brian Seth Jablon

Executive Editor

Janet S. Hankin

Comments Editor

Brian Jeffrey Frank

Casenotes Editor

Michael A. Duff

Business Editor

Elizabeth Gilbert Osterman

Manuscript Editor

Dennis J. Bodley

Associate Editors

Kathleen Calder
Jonathan E. Fink
Laurell Kalvan

John J. Hathway
Douglas Noah Silber

Kevin M. Soper
Denise L. Speer
Mari Stanley

STAFF

Michael Carlis
Susan D. Cobun
Kimberly Detrick
Christopher P. Downs
Patrick Arthur Ferris
Douglas M. Fox
Annette R. Fries
Susan H. Hickes
Mark T. Holtschneider
Michael L. Jennings
Daniel R. Lanier

Thomas P. Lloyd
Dennis Patrick McGlone
Richard L. Miller
Marc D. Minkove
Linda T. Penn
Edward T. Pinder
Nicole Porter
Elena A. Rodney
Louis P. Ruzzi
Mason David Salisbury
Steven M. Sindler

Cheryl D. Snyder
Lisa Stello
Elizabeth Suzan
VanLaningham-Miller
Marjorie H. Wax
Mark A. Wesker
Mary Elizabeth
Wildemann
Wayne Michael
Willoughby
Ralph E. Wilson

Faculty Advisor

Professor Eugene J. Davidson

Assistant Faculty Advisor

Associate Professor John A. Lynch, Jr.